

1 Brian C. Rocca, Bar No. 221576  
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com  
2 Sujal J. Shah, Bar No. 215230  
sujal.shah@morganlewis.com  
3 Michelle Park Chiu, Bar No. 248421  
michelle.chiu@morganlewis.com  
4 Minna Lo Naranjo, Bar No. 259005  
minna.naranjo@morganlewis.com  
5 Rishi P. Satia, Bar No. 301958  
rishi.satia@morganlewis.com  
6 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
7 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596  
Telephone: (415) 442-1000  
8  
9 Richard S. Taffet, *pro hac vice*  
richard.taffet@morganlewis.com  
10 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
101 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10178-0060  
11 Telephone: (212) 309-6000  
12 *Counsel for Defendants*

Glenn D. Pomerantz, Bar No. 112503  
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com  
Kuruvilla Olasa, Bar No. 281509  
kuruvilla.olasa@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100  
Kyle W. Mach, Bar No. 282090  
kyle.mach@mto.com  
Justin P. Raphael, Bar No. 292380  
justin.raphael@mto.com  
Emily C. Curran-Huberty, Bar No. 293065  
emily.curran-huberty@mto.com  
Dane P. Shikman, Bar No. 313656  
dane.shikman@mto.com  
Rebecca L. Sciarrino, Bar No. 336729  
rebecca.sciarrino@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
560 Mission Street, Twenty Seventh Fl.  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 512-4000  
Jonathan I. Kravis, *pro hac vice*  
jonathan.kravis@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
601 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Ste 500E  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 220-1100

13  
14  
15  
16  
17                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
18                   **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
19                   **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

20                   **IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE**  
21                   **ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

22                   THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

23                   *Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case  
24                   No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

**DEFENDANT GOOGLE'S MOTION FOR  
A PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Judge: Hon. James Donato

25  
26  
27  
28

## GOOGLE'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Defendant Google, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5.2(e) and 26(c), moves this Court for an entry of a narrow protective order to govern the disclosure of personally identifiable information (“PII”) at trial for parties and non-parties. This narrow protective order would protect the reasonable privacy interests of current and former party employees—both at Google and at Epic—as well as non-parties. Specifically, Google only asks for the preliminary redaction of employee and former employee email addresses and telephone numbers that would be displayed publicly to the courtroom during trial or later filed with the Court pursuant to the Local Rules. Where redacting an email address would also redact the identity of the sender or recipient of a communication, the parties are to annotate the document with the first and last name of the sender or recipient to make it clear to the Court and the public who the participants of the communication are. Google has attempted to stipulate with Plaintiff to reach an agreement to protect the privacy interest of employees and former employees of both parties and non-parties, but Epic has rebuffed these efforts.<sup>1</sup>

15 Entry of this narrow protective order would relieve the Court from having to address daily  
16 sealing motions during trial to address PII that appears in each exhibit used on each trial day. It  
17 would be more efficient for the parties and the Court to address this issue broadly by protective  
18 order than seriatim motions to seal.

19 Consistent with Ninth Circuit precedent, in a previous order in this action, this Court  
20 redacted the emails of certain Google employees without a sealing motion by either party. See  
21 MDL ECF No. 469 at 1 n.1, 12-14 (“This order will be filed in unredacted form on the public  
22 docket, except for certain employee names which are redacted below.”). Courts in the Ninth  
23 Circuit routinely seal email addresses and other personal identifying information under the  
24 compelling reasons standard due to the potential privacy harm to the individual whose contact  
25 information may be exposed. See, e.g., *In re Pac. Fertility Ctr. Litig.*, No. 18-cv-01586, 2021 WL  
26 1082843, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2021) (sealing email addresses under compelling reasons

<sup>28</sup> <sup>1</sup> Notably Epic redacted employee email addresses in trial exhibits used in *Epic Games, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, 4:20-cv-05640-YGR (N.D. Cal.).

1 standard); *see also Kumandan v. Google LLC*, 2022 WL 17971633, No. 19-cv-04286, at \*1 (N.D.  
2 Cal. Nov. 17, 2022) (listing cases sealing email addresses and other PII under compelling reasons  
3 standard); *Snapkeys, Ltd. v. Google LLC*, No. 19-CV-02658-LHK, 2021 WL 1951250, at \*3 (N.D.  
4 Cal. May 14, 2021) (granting Google’s motion to file under seal personally identifiable  
5 information of its current and former employees, including their email addresses and telephone  
6 numbers); *Sameer v. Khera*, No. 17-cv-01748-DAD-EPG, 2018 WL 4772035, at \*1 (E.D. Cal.  
7 Oct. 1, 2018); *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1137 (9th Cir. 2003); *U.S.  
ex rel. Lockyer v. Hawaii Pac. Health*, No. CIV. 04-00596 ACK-LE, 2007 WL 128853, at \*1 (D.  
9 Haw. Jan. 10, 2007).

10 This case has attracted and will continue to attract media attention. Google simply seeks to  
11 protect the reasonable privacy interests of all party employees and former employees from  
12 potential harassment that could result from the broad release of their non-public contact  
13 information. Entry of the proposed protective order would offer Google employees some  
14 protection against such risks, and this same protection should be extended to plaintiff’s employees  
15 and non-parties as well.

16 Google respectfully requests entry of the proposed protective order to govern disclosure of  
17 PII during trial proceedings.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED: November 5, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Rishi P. Satia  
3 Rishi P. Satia

4 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

5 Minna Lo Naranjo  
6 Brian C. Rocca  
7 Sujal J. Shah  
8 Michelle Park Chiu  
9 Rishi P. Satia

10 **MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON LLP**

11 Glenn D. Pomerantz  
12 Kuruvilla Olasa  
13 Emily C. Curran-Huberty  
14 Jonathan I. Kravis  
15 Justin P. Raphael  
16 Kyle W. Mach  
17 Dane Shikman  
18 Rebecca L. Sciarrino  
19 Lauren Beck

20 *Counsel for Defendants*

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28